

Application No. 10/776,538
Amendment dated December 4, 2007
Reply to Office Action of September 4, 2007

Docket No.: 3722-0177P

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 remain present in this application.

The specification and claims 1, 5, 6 and 10 have been amended. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Amendments to the Claims

It is respectfully submitted that the foregoing amendments to the claims should not be considered to contain new matter. For example, steps (a') to (d') in independent claim 1 should not be considered to contain new matter, because the original specification sets forth that "steps S4 to S7 may be repeated until all scan lines are finished" (see page 5, lines 14-15). It is also noted that steps (b') to (d') should not be considered to contain new matter because the original specification sets forth that "steps S4' to S7' may be repeated until all scan lines are finished" (see page 6, lines 15-16).

Rejections under 35 USC 102 and 103

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Street, U.S. Patent 5,377,022. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 6-8 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Street et al. in view of Tevs, U.S. Publication 2002/0064300. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Street et al. in view of Tevs, and further in view of Lauxtermann et al., U.S. Publication 2001/0015831. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Application No. 10/776,538
Amendment dated December 4, 2007
Reply to Office Action of September 4, 2007

Docket No.: 3722-0177P

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Street et al. in view of Tevs and further in view of Nagano, U.S. Patent 5,687,003. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

First, it is noted that both independent claims 1 and 6 have been amended to recite that two lines of the same document are scanned separately.

Street discloses a paper handling device, which uses a two-dimensional imaging sensor array in combination with a single flash of light being produced from the illuminator. Accordingly, it is unnecessary to perform two scanning operations to obtain two image signals corresponding to two lines of the same document using the paper handling device of Street. Street therefore fails to teach or suggest the method of independent claims 1 and 6.

The secondary references to Tevs, Lauxtermann et al., and Nagano fail to overcome the above-noted deficiencies of Street.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the prior art utilized by the Examiner, either alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest the method of independent claims 1 and 6, as well as their dependent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC 102 and 103 rejections are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Favorable reconsideration and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.


Application No. 10/776,538
Amendment dated December 4, 2007
Reply to Office Action of September 4, 2007

Docket No.: 3722-0177P

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: December 4, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joe McKinney Muncy
Registration No.: 32,334
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant